#### **COLCHESTER PLANNING COMMISSION**

#### MINUTES OF THE MEETING

# **September 21, 2010**

**PRESENT**: Tom Mulcahy, Pam Loranger, Rich Paquette, Tim Ahonen, and Robert

Scheck

ALSO PRESENT: Sarah Hadd, Director

1. Call to Order

**Tom Mulcahy** called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

# 2. IWRMP Update Presentation

Brad Aldrich of Forcier and Aldrich began the presentation and then turned it over to David Healy of Stone Environmental that spoke to a town-wide parcel assessment. There was discussion about on-site septic suitability and the land's ability to support the expected buildout of zoning. B. Aldrich reviewed the status of on-site assessments. The purpose of Town wide assessment was to focus on areas for field investigations. A lot of the limiting parcels are on the shoreline which will be one of the initial focused areas. After additional assessments are done the chart will be more accurate. Soils tests will be performed for more accurate assessments of parcels. P. Loranger asked about the relation of the project to the Fire District Two pursuit of sewers. B. Osborne stated that the project began much before Fire District Two began its current investigations of sewers and has tried to keep the District apprised of the project through open invitations to monitor the project. B. Aldrich concluded with stating that additional updates will be forthcoming as the project moves forward.

### 3. Severance Corners: Density, Uses, and Design Discussion

T. Mulcahy began the conversation by stating that the Commission was willing to consider modifications to the zoning at Severance Corners and would like to hear from the developers within the area to see what their thoughts were. Robin Jeffers of S.D. Ireland provided an overview of the Severance Village under construction. There was discussion on increased density, a higher percentage of commercial development, increasing height requirements, and the want to make the area look more like a New England village. R. Jeffers stated that increased density would assist in the buildout however she had concerns about the limits on number of units for Act 250 exemptions. B. Frisbee stated that he welcomed a conversation on density and regulations however recognized how complex of an issue the growth center can become. He provided an overview of his project and the issues with the Army Corp and the EPA that he had encountered recently that might additionally hamper density on his project. There was discussion about the aesthetics of the project and the intention to make it look colonial revival however accommodating for modern amenities such as garages. T. Mulcahy

stated that the Commission was considering design standards that were perhaps not as stringent as surrounding communities. There was discussion about density and volume and the need to get momentum and buy-in for higher density. The Commission requested the developers to examine maximum densities, setbacks, height requirements, and the Table of Permissible Uses and recommend modifications. R. Jeffers showed the inn model and discussed the feasibility of increasing heights to realize Adirondack mountain views. Setbacks for zoning versus fire regulations were discussed as well as opportunities for more entertainment venues. The developers were encouraged to come back with their proposals.

#### 4. Review of FD2 Presentation to CEDAC

There was discussion about the parallel tracks of the FD's efforts and the Town's and the disconnect between the two. It was recommended that the District's efforts continue to be tracked and updates provided to the Commission.

### 5. Minutes of August 17, 2010

Continued until the next meeting.

# 6. Review Future Agendas

Copies of the sign regulations were requested in advance of the next meeting with the temporary sign regulations flagged.

### 7. Packet Information

The Vermont Land Trust letter was reviewed. The Municipal Planning Grant application process was reviewed and it was agreed that the Heineberg / Prim Road corridor could be examined for new zoning district and an application made.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to be brought before the Commission, a motion was made and seconded by P. Loranger to adjourn the meeting. All members of the Commission present voted in favor of the motion and the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

	Planning Commission
Approved this 5th day of October 2010	
1 2	
Thinking thing i will i top to trully swelling of thing 2 ion.	

Minutes taken and respectfully submitted by Jane Dion.